

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/657,512		09/08/2003	David L. Cutsforth	1099.1103102 9160	
28075	7590	01/12/2006		EXAMINER	
CROMPTO 1221 NICOL	•	GER & TUFTE, LI	MCDONALD, SHANTESE L		
SUITE 800				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403-2420				3723	
				DATE MAIL ED: 01/12/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	•				
	Office Action Commons	10/657,512	CUTSFORTH, DAVID L.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Shantese L. McDonald	3723					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	opears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address	•,				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply I d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS te, cause the application to become ABAND	FION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. SONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 (</u>	October 2005						
		is action is non-final.		•				
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
ا ال	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Lx parte Quayle, 1905 C.D. 11	, 1 55 O.G. 215.					
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)	4)☐ Claim(s) <u>34-38,44-46 and 51-62</u> is/are pending in the application.							
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	Claim(s) <u>46,51,52 and 57-59</u> is/are allowed.							
·								
-								
· —								
ت (۵	claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examin	ier.		•				
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ ac	cepted or b) objected to by t	he Examiner.	•				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	\$17				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ction is required if the drawing(s) is	s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)).				
11) 🔲	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		• , ,					
•	•							
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			•				
12) 🔲 .	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(a)-(d) or (f).					
a)[☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		•					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received in Appli	cation No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri	ority documents have been rec	eived in this National Stage					
	application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		•				
* S	See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	t of the certified copies not rec	eived.					
	,							
				ę.				
Attachment								
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date.								
2)								
_	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	, ,					
S Datent and Tr	1 000			<u>; `</u>				

Application/Control Number: 10/657,512

Art Unit: 3723

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 56,59 and 62 all recite the limitation "the finished depth" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 34,36-38,53-56 and 60-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall in view of Millas.

Marshall teaches forming a groove in a collector ring of an electrical motor, (col. 5, lines 60-64). Marshall teaches all the limitations of the claims except for cutting the groove using a hand held rotary grinder, and the groove having a first depth before the method is performed and a second depth after the method is performed and the finished depth of the groove being between 0.02 and 0.375 inches. Millas teaches using a hand held rotary grinder to produce grooves in a workpiece, (col. 1, lines 6-34). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to make the groove of Marshall using a hand held rotary grinder, as taught by Millas,

Application/Control Number: 10/657,512

Art Unit: 3723

since the Marshall reference is silent as to what actually performs the machining of the groove, and the Millas reference teaches that it is known in the art to used a hand held grinder in order to mill or cut grooves in a workpiece. It would have been further obvious for the groove to have a first depth before the method and a second depth after the method, and for the finished depth to be between 0.02 and 0.375 inches, since it is obvious when cutting a groove for the operator to first begin cutting the groove and then choose to enlarge or further cut the groove, and also for the finish depth to be between 0.02 and 0.375, dependant upon the desired finished groove.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 35,44 and 45 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 46,51,52 and 57-59 allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 34,36-38,53-56 and 60-62 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shantese L. McDonald whose telephone number is (571) 272-4486. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on (571) 272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S.L.M. January 9, 2006

> Joseph J. Hail, III Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 3700

July Haile